DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 335 HE 025 309

AUTHOR Buzza, Bonnie Wilson; Whiteaker, Julie E.
TITLE A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs: 1991, Second Phase of Study.
INSTITUTION Saint Cloud State Univ., MN.; Wooster Coll., Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY Pew Memorial Trust, Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 63p.; For the study's first phase, see ED 315 002.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Departments; Educational Trends; Extracurricular Activities; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Longitudinal Studies; Minority Groups; *Program Content; Program Descriptions; *Small Colleges; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; Teacher Characteristics; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The second phase of a longitudinal project to describe and monitor speech communication programs at small colleges, expanded the data available on programs and provided an indication of program changes in the 3-year period since the first phase, which gathered initial data on the programs. The pilot study conducted in the first phase involved a survey questionnaire, sent to 350 faculty members, with a final response rate of 45 percent. The second phase consisted of questionnaires mailed to those who had participated in and responded to the first survey (157 mailed with 88 returned). The data from the second survey were analyzed and compared with data from the first. The analysis found: considerable diversity among small colleges; a slight decline in the overall percentage of institutions with an institution-wide speech requirement; the more frequent use of the word "communication" rather than "speech" in the department's title; and a slight increase in the number of faculty of diverse racial background teaching at small colleges. Included are 2 appendixes containing an extensive series of tables, and 13 references. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs: 1991, Second Phase of Study

Because of the unavailability of normative data on speech programs at small colleges, these departments and communication programs often must do curriculum and staff planning without a strong sense of what is taking place in program development in the discipline at similar institutions. Good descriptive data on programs, curriculum, and faculty help provide a college with a reference point for its own individual department and course development and for its staffing considerations. Furthermore, noting national trends on an ongoing basis helps keep small programs up to date in the discipline.

This research is the second phase of a longitudinal project to describe and monitor speech communication programs on small campuses, as well as small programs at larger institutions. Data from the pilot project, conducted in 1987-88, was used to create an information base of academic programs and faculty composition. This second phase, conducted in 1989-90, expands the data available on programs and, by comparing the results of the two studies, provides an indication of program changes in the three-year period.

Previous Research

Since the inception of the SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs in 1978, a question which has continued to engage Committee members is that of similarities and differences between programs. It had originally been assumed that small college speech programs were much alike and led to heavy and diverse faculty teaching loads, a feeling of professional isolation among small college faculty members, and considerable responsibility placed on individual faculty members for program maintenance and development. While those latter considerations continue to be voiced, differences in individual programs have become apparent.

Smitter and MacDoniels (1983) noted wide-ranging diversity in curricular offerings among the 61 institutions they sampled, and (1985) cited diversity in mission statements. Their findings on curriculum and program diversity generated a series of summer conferences to explore "The Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication at the Small College" (Smitter and Buzza, 1987). Buzza (1983, 1984) noted departmental differences among Associated Colleges of the Midwest and Great Lakes Colleges Association institutions. Manning (1982) sampled for comparison 4 institutions from the two consortia Buzza considered.

Developing a methodology for analysis, however, has been slow. In the research noted above both Buzza and Smitter/MacDoniels relied upon information obtained from studying college catalogues. Manning conducted telephone interviews, but of a limited sample size. Waite (1985) mailed a survey to 90 small colleges and universities in the Midwest and received 46 responses. His was the most standard methodology, but is still of a small population.

Earlier studies of small college speech programs were similarly limited in scope. Boase (1965) sampled 41 institutions. More recent national surveys conducted on a large scale by the Association for Communication Administration (Becker, et. al., 1983, 1984; Elmore, 1990) either didn't consider small college programs or didn't break out small college programs for separate analysis. The first phase of the current study (Buzza and Holmes, 1989), however,

surveyed the full national membership of the Speech Communication Association's Committee on Small College Speech Programs, some 350 persons, for purposes of analysis and comparison 1) to help determine trends in program development in speech communication in smaller institutions, 2) to assist faculty members and administrators in program development, and 3) to assist the Committee on Small College Speech Programs with member services. Having the base data available, program change and development as well as faculty trends can be noted and analyzed. As the longitudinal project continues, ongoing developments among programs and faculty can be monitored.

Limitations of the Study

The 1987 study was conducted to determine if a longitudinal study would be useful and practical, as well as to assist in the development of the survey instrument and the format for data analysis. It had the limitations of a pilot study, many of which were overcome in this second phase of the research.

There is a difference between doing formulative and reactive research. In formulative research an inductive model is used. Broad information is sought and observations are made which can lead to generalizations for further research and testing. Reactive research uses a deductive model to test generalizations in the form of hypotheses. This research continues to be of the formulative type. A broad series of questions were asked and responses tabulated to guide in the generation of directions and questions for program and faculty development as well as for further research.

Many of the open-ended questions from the pilot survey were re-phrased as closed questions for the second study, and responses were then coded to make tabulations possible. Some questions still need to be revised for the ongoing study, but most were satisfactory. Slightly rephrased questions make an absolute comparison between the 1987 and 1989 surveys impossible, but since descriptive rather than causal data is the goal the comparisons remain useful.

Budgetary considerations constrained both surveys. The pilot study was sent along with the newsletter of the Small College Committee to its membership to save postage costs. No return envelopes were provided. The questionnaire was included with three newsletter mailings to help encourage responses. In the current study one mailing was sent directly to members responding to the earlier survey, rather than accompanying the newsletter, with no second mailing. No return envelope was provided.

Data analysis was slow until the Pew grant at the College of Wooster provided research assistance. The original data were obtained during 1987, but final data analysis was not completed until 1989 by Kelli Holmes. The new survey was mailed in September of 1989 and analysis was completed during 1989-90 by Julie Whiteaker. Comparisons of results took place during 90-91 and give an indication of program change over the period.

Method of the Study

Pilot study.

Context. During 1986 refinement began on the mailing list of members of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs of the Speech Communication Association, along with the development of a directory of research and teaching interests of the members. In 1987 the research survey accompanied issues of the organization's newsletter and members were encouraged to return the information requested to provide demographic data on programs and personnel.

Survey Form. The two page response form contained three sections. Part A included member name, address, and institutional affiliation along with areas of primary research and teaching interest. Part B included information on the recipient's department and program. Part C included information on staffing in the department. Members completing the response forms were encouraged to provide information in all three sections, but a few completed only the first section. Most completed part B and many completed part C, but in this latter part there were often incomplete responses in addition to a lower response rate. When information was requested on several faculty members, for example, not all information was provided on all members of the department.

Rate of Return. Questionnaires were mailed to some 350 members over a period of about eighteen months. They were included as part of the regular newsletter mailings, on a separate sheet of a contrasting color. Members thus received the questionnaire more than once, although those adding themselves to the mailing list over that time period, approximately thirty people, may have received only one mailing. Several members also filled out the questionnaire more than once, and duplicates were removed before tabulation of the data. Occasionally several members of one department were on the mailing list and thus all received mailings. The individual responses were retained for part A, the mailing list and directory. Institutional duplicates were removed prior to data tabulation from the survey. The most current information was used when members responded more than once; the report of the department chair was used for institutional data when several members of a department replied.

Of the approximately 350 questionnaires mailed, 157 were returned for a response rate of 45%. There were a total of 134 usable surveys, but not necessarily 134 responses to each question since some respondents did not reply to all questions.

Analysis of Data. Originally an informal analysis and reporting of data had been intended; however, with increased availability of computers and software for data analysis it was decided to do a more complete analysis of the initial data, despite constraints on the analysis imposed by the data's occasional incompleteness (especially concerning the profiles of faculty members) and the need to convert some responses to numerical and at times closed-ended questions.

Part A, "Mailing List and Directory Information," was placed into a database using Filemaker II where it could be updated, converted to mailing labels for future mailings, and sorted to provide a directory and lists of names and addresses of members of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs who have particular research interests and areas of teaching expertise.

Part B, "Information on Departments," was placed into a similar database for storage, and then converted for use with Statview 512+. Frequency distributions were obtained for all responses, but five factors were particularly considered in the initial analysis:

1) institution size and type
2) perception of the institution as a small college
3) presence or absence of a college-wide speech requirement
4) number of full and part time faculty in the department
5) presence or absence of an extra-curricular speech activity program.

Questions were also asked concerning courses offered and areas of the discipline emphasized by individual departments, but responses were so varied that tabulation was impossible. The revised survey used a closed question format for these responses.

Part C, "Information on Faculty Members," was also placed into the database and the statistical package. In the initial analysis several factors were noted:

1) Faculty size: numbers of full-time and part time faculty members
2) Faculty status: whether positions were tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured
3) Academic ranks of faculty members
4) Seniority: years faculty members had been at the institution
5) Highest degree held by the faculty member
6) Year highest degree was received
7) Undergraduate background: if faculty member had attended a small college
8) Race of faculty members*
9) Gender of faculty members*

*Participation in the survey or response to any particular question was optional for the respondent.

Second Phase.

Context. Based on the responses to the pilot study the questionnaire was revised and sent in 1989 to members of the SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs responding to the original survey. The Committee membership includes faculty at small colleges, in small programs at larger institutions, and in large programs at larger institutions but who have an interest in small college programs. In sorting by institution size, responses from the groups can be differentiated.

Survey Form. The revised form again contained several sections. Parts I and II included information on the respondent, used to update the Directory of Small College Speech Programs. This use was specified on the form and kept separate from the other parts. Part III included information on the department or program. Part IV included general information on the faculty member's background and professional status. Respondents were asked to provide copies of Part IV for all members of their department and to distribute them so that information on the entire faculty could be obtained. They could return the forms individually or as a group. Duplicate responses were screened, but not all departmental members returned the forms.

Rate of Return. Of the 157 questionnaires mailed, 88 were returned for a response rate of 56%, slightly higher than for the pilot study although the total number of responses was smaller. Because each faculty member supplied the personal information requested in Part IV, it should be more accurate than that of the pilot study which had been supplied by a single person. There were a total of 227 usable surveys for Part IV, but not necessarily 227 responses to each question since some respondents did not reply to all questions.

Analysis of Data. Parts I and II were placed into the Small College database using Filemaker II. Parts III and IV, information on departments and faculty members, were placed into Wingz for analysis and comparison with the previous demographic information. The following characteristics were examined:

Institutional data:

1) population of community in which institution is located
2) institution size and type (public or private; 2 year or 4 year; whether or not there were graduate offerings)
3) presence or absence of a system of tenure
4) perception of the institution as a small college
5) presence or absence of a college-wide speech requirement, a program of "speaking across the curriculum," and/or communication/speech proficiency requirement
6) inclusion of courses in the institution's general education distribution requirements, and the specific area or division where the courses were included
7) name of the department
8) academic areas emphasized in the department
9) number of full and part time faculty in the department
10) presence or absence of an extra-curricular speech activity program, and type of activities offered

Faculty Data:

1) Faculty status: whether positions were tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured
2) Academic ranks of faculty members
3) Seniority: years faculty members had been at the institution
4) Highest degree held by the faculty member
5) Year highest degree was received
6) Undergraduate background: if faculty member had attended a small college, and if so whether or not it was the institution where he or she was currently employed
7) Whether or not faculty member had had previous teaching experience at a small college and/or a large institution
8) Race of faculty members*
9) Gender of faculty members*

*Participation in the survey or response to any particular question was optional for the respondent.

Results and Discussion

Institutional Data

Appendix A summarizes the data for the whole group of institutions, for the faculty as a whole, and for female and male faculty. Appendix B provides information for institutions by size: under 500, 500-1000, 1000-1500, 1500-2000, 2000-3000, 3000-5000, over 5000 students.

The first factor considered institution size and type. Many of the institutions reporting on the first study fit the stereotype of "small, private, liberal arts colleges." Of the 128 institutions reporting, **96% were 4-year institutions. 88.3% were private rather than public**. Surprisingly, however, 51% granted graduate degrees in some area, although only **3% offered some sort of graduate degree in speech**. These degrees were offered at institutions of 500 to 1000 students, 1500 to 2000 students, and over 5000 students.

In the second study there were minor changes in the pattern of the 88 institutions reporting. **99% were 4 year institutions, 82% were private. 50% had graduate offerings in any department, but only 5 institutions had graduate offerings in speech** (one was an institution of 2000-3000 students; the other graduate programs were at four of the seven institutions with over 5000 students).

In the first study, 72% of the institutions had enrollments below 2000 students, with three categories having almost equal proportions, as follows:

5.5% -- under 500 students
22.7% -- 500 to 1000 students
22.7% -- 1000 to 1500 students
21.1% -- 1500 to 2000 students
17.2% -- 2000 to 3000 students
7.0% -- 3000 to 5000 students
3.8% -- over 5000 students

In the second study, 61% of the institutions had enrollments below 2000 students, with the student body size as a whole shifting slightly upward as follows:

6% -- under 500 students
15.7% -- 500 to 1000 students
19.1% -- 1000 to 1500 students
20.2% -- 1500 to 2000 students
20.2% -- 2000 to 3000 students
10.1% -- 3000 to 5000 students
7.9% -- over 5000 students

Two new question areas were then considered in the second study, involving population of the community in which the institution was located and the presence of systems of tenure in the institution or for the department. The small colleges in the study were spread throughout communities of all sizes, as follows:

Communities of 5,000 and under	10.6%
Communities of 5,000-10,000	**21.2%**
Communities of 10,000 to 25,000	15.3%
Communities of 25,000 to 50,000	9.4%
Communities of 50,000 to 100,000	**20%**
Communities of 100,000 to a million	17.6%
Communities of over a million people	5.9%

Respondents came from all parts of the country, although it should be noted that most small colleges are located in the Central, Northeastern, and Southeastern regions and fewer in the Northwest and Southwest. This is consistent with the general pattern of colleges and universities in the United States.

Eighty-three of the eighty-eight institutions responding have a tenure system for the institution itself, and eighty-two have tenure lines in the Speech Communication Department.

The fourth factor considered the institution's self-perception as a small college. In the first study 92.2% of the institutions responding considered themselves small colleges; 4.7% considered themselves small programs in larger institutions; 3.1% considered themselves to be at large institutions but supporters of small colleges. In the second study 87% of the institutions responding considered themselves small colleges; 6.8% considered themselves small programs in larger institutions; 5.7% considered themselves to be at large institutions but supporters of small colleges. These comments are consistent with the slightly larger sizes of the institutions responding to the second survey.

The fifth factor considered the presence or absence of a speech requirement. In the first study **a college-wide speech requirement was present in 55% of the institutions overall, and the requirement was more common at smaller institutions.** For example, 71% of the colleges with under 500 students had a speech requirement; 67% of the colleges of 500-1000 students had speech requirements; and 58% of the colleges of 1000-1500 students had such requirements. In contrast, 49% of the colleges of 1500-2000 students had those requirements; 42% of those 2000-3000 had them, 44% of those 3000 to 5000, and 50% of those over 5000 had them.

In the second study **a college-wide speech requirement was present in 52% of the institutions overall, a decline,** and there were changes in the sizes of the institutions with the requirement. **Smaller institutions seemed to be dropping the overall requirement, middle-sized institutions were inconsistent in their patterns, and a number of larger institutions seemed to be adding such requirements.** In the current study 67% of the colleges with under 500 students had a speech requirement (down from 71%); 43% of the colleges of 500-1000 students had speech requirements (down from 67%). In contrast, 63% of the colleges of 1000-1500 students had such requirements (up from 58%); 41% of the colleges of 1500-2000 students had those requirements (down from 49%).

Larger institutions reflected increases, however, with 47% of those 2000-3000 having requirements (up from 42%) , 67% of those 3000 to 5000 having them (up greatly from 44% in the previous study), and 57% of those over 5000 having them (up from 50%). The lowered percentages may be reflective of the practicalities of staffing such requirements at smaller

institutions which could be experiencing shrinkage in overall faculty size. The increases at larger institutions may be reflective of an increased national concern with communication skills. **This finding bears considerable attention in the longitudinal monitoring of programs.**

The second study also asked questions regarding "speaking across the curriculum" programs and the practice of enabling speech communication courses to be used in partial fulfillment of general education distribution requirements. **In approximately 90% of the cases, one or more speech communication course could be used to fulfill such requirements. Although there is some inclusion of speech communication courses in the social sciences, not unexpectedly the discipline is generally placed within the more traditional humanities or fine arts divisions at these smaller colleges.** The specific requirement toward which the course(s) might be counted is as follows:

Natural Sciences/Mathematics	4
Social/Behavioral Sciences	13
Humanities	**24**
Fine/Performing Arts	**21**
Humanities and Fine/Performing Arts	**11**
English/Language/Literature	**22**
Other	21

Only **eight institutions reported having "speaking across the curriculum" programs**, and there was no pattern regarding institutional size except that two of the six were institutions with fewer than 500 students and two had from 1,500 to 2,000 students.

The question of departmental names, however, reflects a less conservative stance. **The name "Speech" seems to have been replaced by the name "Communication," even in small college speech programs.** Of the 88 institutions in the study, only 1 had a "Speech" department; 12 were departments of "Speech Communication, " but the great majority, 45%, had the name "Communication Studies or Communication Arts." There are **few combined speech and drama departments, at least by departmental name**, although as the next area of consideration by the researchers indicates, theatre or drama offerings continue. The use of departmental names is summarized on the following table:

Speech	1
Speech Communication	**12**
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	**40**
Speech and Theatre	4
Communication and Theatre/Drama	4
Speech Communication and Theatre/Drama	4
Speech and (anything else)	4
Communication and (anything else)	8
English	4
Other	7

There were no departments named Communication Disorders, Speech Pathology, Mass Communication, or Theatre/Dramatic Arts, although as the next area of the survey indicates, there were offerings in all those areas. They are likely subsumed under the "Communication Studies" or "Communication Arts" departmental names. No institution reported it was simply a service area within another discipline, thus all programs seem to retain a sense of individual identity even if combined with another discipline into a department.

Areas of curricular offerings were the next points of consideration for the second study. Respondents were asked which areas were emphasized within their departments and provided with the list of possibilities. Respondents on the pilot study were given a more general question about their areas of emphasis, but even with the revised format respondents interpreted the idea of "emphasis" very broadly, seemingly marking all areas in which courses were offered rather than in considering the areas *emphasized* within the department. (i.e., it is difficult to understand how a department of three or four faculty members could emphasize five or six diverse program areas). In the next phase of the research, this question will be further clarified for respondents. However, information was obtained on areas the departments felt were emphasized. The 88 respondents noted a total of 415 areas, and **public speaking is the most consistently listed area** with 56 citations. **Interpersonal/small group communication followed closely** with 53 citations, and media/ broadcasting/and related courses was a close third with 51. These were followed by **argumentation/persuasion/debate** with 36 listings and **theatre/dramatic arts** with 35. The total listing follows:

Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	**36**
Communication Research Methods	6
Communication Theory and Related Courses	26
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	4
Gender and Communication	1
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	5
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	4
Interpersonal/Small Group Communication	**53**
Intrapersonal Communication	5
Journalism and Related Courses	25
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	**51**
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	11
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	27
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	25
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	20
Public Speaking	**56**
Speech Communication Education	5
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	5
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	**35**
Voice and Diction	8
Other	7

The ninth factor considered in the survey was number of faculty within the department. In the first study **a full-time faculty size of 4 seemed to be common, despite institutional size**. 29% of the colleges of under 500 students had 2 faculty members, but another 29% had 4. Similarly, most colleges of 500 to 1000 students had 2 (31%) or 4 (31%) full time faculty members. 42% of the colleges of 1000 to 1500 students had 4 full time faculty members, 35% of the colleges of 1500 to 2000 students had 4 full time faculty members, 28% of the institutions of 2000 to 3000 students had 4 full-time faculty members. Institutions of 3000 to 5000 students reported faculty sizes of 5 and 6, and **the one institution of over 5000 reporting faculty size in the first study had two full-time and one part-time faculty member, providing an example of a small program being located at a larger institution.**

In the second study department size was queried but so was the number of faculty teaching speech communication within the department. For purposes of program planning and monitoring disciplinary status, this is the more relevant figure. **Four institutions of the 88 responding reported having no full-time faculty in speech communication. Twenty-six institutions, 31%, had only 1 faculty member doing full-time teaching of speech.**

twelve or 14% had 2 doing so, thirteen or 15% had 3 full time faculty, and seventeen or 20% had 4 full time faculty. Six institutions had 5 full-time speech faculty, two had 6 full-time faculty, and eight had more than 6 full-time faculty. **The number of institutions having none or only 1 faculty member teaching speech communication at an institution bears careful monitoring for the future, both for program development and for the overall status of the discipline in educational institutions. Such "single person departments" are highly vulnerable to program elimination, as well as faculty burnout.**

The appendix is a table of sizes of departmental faculty by institutional size, noting total faculty as well as speech communication faculty, and full and part time positions. **While faculties of four people teaching speech full time are found in some institutions, this clearly is not as prevalent as had been suggested in the earlier study.**

Four of the colleges of under 500 students had only 1 faculty member teaching speech full time, and two had no such full time faculty. In colleges of 500 to 1000 students, nine (64%) had only 1 full time speech faculty member, two (14%) had 2 full time speech faculty, two (14%) had 3 such faculty, and one (7%) had no full time faculty members teaching speech. One college of 1000 to 1500 students also had no full time faculty in speech, ten (59%) had 1 faculty full time in speech, one each had 2 and 4 faculty, and four (23.5%) had 3 full-time faculty members teaching speech .

Of the institutions of 2000 to 3000 students, five had faculties of 4 teaching speech full time, and four each had faculties of 3 or 2. One institution had a single full-time faculty member in speech, but three others had more than 6 full time in speech. Institutions of 3000 to 5000 students reported varying faculty sizes, including 33% with faculties of 4. The smallest number of full-time faculty was 2 in any department in these institutions, and one reported more than 6 full time faculty in the department.

In institutions over 5000, one reported a full-time faculty of 1. There was a department in the pilot study which was clearly a small program at a larger institution, and this may well be that same program. Of the other institutions, there were one department of 4, two departments of 5, one department of 6, and two of more than 6 full time faculty teaching speech.

Use of part-time faculty members continues to be common. Four of the six institutions of under 500 students have part-time faculty members. At institutions of 500 to 1000 students, twelve of the fourteen use from 1 to 4 part-time faculty. Most of the campuses of larger size use from 1 to more than 6 part-time faculty members. The table below reflects overall use of part time faculty:

No. of Part-time	No. of Depts.	Percent
0	16	17.98%
1	19	21.35%
2	21	23.60%
3	9	10.11%
4	8	8.99%
5	4	4.49%
6	4	4.49%
More than 6	8	8.99%

The final area studied under institutional data was the extra-curricular program. In the pilot study **the presence of an extra-curricular speech program (debate, individual events, readers theatre, or theatre) was not common**. 15% of all institutions reported having an NDT debate program and 34% reported having a CEDA debate program, but the researchers believe the phrasing of the question on the survey may have been unclear, and thus

caution was urged in interpreting this data. 40% of the institutions reporting had some kind of individual events program, 21% had a readers theatre, and 48% a drama program.

In the early study the data were sufficiently unreliable to make the researchers report only general trends by campus size, not percentages. Debate (NDT or CEDA) was reported on the very small campuses (under 1000), the mid-size campuses, and the larger campuses, with the very smallest campuses frequently reporting some kind of debate program. This was consistent with the finding of a required speech course on those campuses, possibly indicating an institutional commitment to speech and speech activities. Fewer mid-size campuses reported having a debate program, but it became more common at larger institutions. Individual events were more prevalent than debate on the mid-range campuses, if there was a speech activity program reported. There was little consistency in the presence or absence of a drama program, but the departmental structure which in some cases provided for a combined department probably affected this data.

In the second study the question was rephrased and the responses likely more accurate. The question was asked in more detail, as well. Eighty-seven campuses responded to this question, and 75 or 86% report having some kind of extra-curricular program. The most common programs were drama (40 campuses), individual events competition (39 campuses), and a campus radio station (38 campuses). Debate, particularly NDT debate, was very rare at the small colleges (3 NDT programs reported). The overall listing from the 87 campuses is below:

NDT debate	3
CEDA debate	18
Other debate	11
Readers Theatre	15
Individual Events	39
Drama/Theatre	40
Dance	4
TV station	14
Radio station	38
Newspaper	28
Yearbook	13
Other activities	14

Faculty Data

Faculty data were gathered in several categories. One grouping of questions considered the tenure status of the faculty member, along with rank and seniority. This information is useful in considering the vulnerability of small programs in times of potential retrenchment. Non-tenured faculty in the junior ranks, particularly those not on tenure lines, are particularly vulnerable. Small programs headed by senior faculty nearing retirement are also potentially vulnerable since program elimination becomes easier in such circumstances.

Information on highest degrees and when such degrees were granted provides one indication of the kinds of faculty development needs that may be apparent. For faculty working in relative isolation in small programs, conversations which stimulate thinking about disciplinary trends may be less frequent on home campuses which lack colleagues with shared disciplinary interests. Attendance at professional conventions or conferences such as the Hope College Summer Faculty Development Conferences, designed to help update small college faculty members on new thinking within key areas of the discipline, become important if faculty are to become or continue to be refreshed and up to date on the discipline.

Additionally, such information, coupled with information on gender and racial variables, can assist in tracking efforts of institutions and the discipline as a whole to provide equity in the professional advancement of its members.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie W. Buzza

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Questions concerning previous experiences at small colleges, either as a student or as a faculty member, can assist search committees in understanding the kinds of educational and career experiences influencing persons to select the small college environment for their teaching context.

Information on faculty in the first survey was based on a sample of 386 faculty members. Data in most cases is based on a sample size ranging from 350 to 360 since respondents did not answer all questions. One person in the department provided the information on all departmental members. In the second survey individual faculty members responded in providing personal data. There were 227 faculty responding, but again some variation in total numbers of responses from time to time because all respondents did not answer all questions.

Faculty composition and tenure status. **81% of the faculty in the first study were full time faculty members,** 15% were part time and 3% were temporary appointments. **61% were tenured,** and 39% were tenure track among those responding to that question. About 70 did not check either alternative and were probably in non-tenure track, part time, or temporary positions. The second survey attempted to clarify this data.

In the second study **89% of the faculty were full time and 11% part time; 15% of the respondents indicated that they were on temporary appointments.** There may still have been confusion among a few respondents regarding non-tenured versus non-tenure track positions, although the revised question improved the response rate. **100 faculty, or 44%, indicated that they were tenured, and 126 or 56% that they were not.** 129 faculty, however, responded to the question regarding the tenure-track status of their non-tenured appointments--so there may an error of 3 in the data, or 3 faculty may simply have answered only the second question. However, **of the 129 faculty describing their non-tenured status, 72 or 56% indicated they were in tenure track appointments and 57 or 44% that their positions were non-tenure track.**

There was thus an increase in percentage of full-time appointments between the original and the follow-up studies, but a decline in the percentage of faculty members with tenure. In the context of other data, however, this may be reflective of a "younger" or "newer" professorate rather than a loss of tenured positions. Overall, faculty in the second study were in lower ranks, had "newer degrees" and had less seniority.

Academic rank. Faculty ranks for these in the first study ranged as follows:

Lecturer	3.4%
Instructor	16.6%
Assistant	**33.8%**
Associate	**23.9%**
Professor	**22.3%**

In the second study the information was:

Lecturer	2.23%
Instructor	14.73%
Assistant	**38.84%**
Associate	**24.55%**
Professor	**19.64%**

Seniority. 45% of those responding to the first study had been at the institution five years or less and 27% had been there sixteen years or more. The overall breakdown was as follows:

Five years or less	**45%**
Six to ten years	18%
Eleven to fifteen years	9%
Sixteen or more years	**27%**

In the second study, the categories were further broken down, with the results as follows:

In their first year	**16%**		
Two-five years	**29%**	**Five years or less**	**45%**
Six to ten years	20%		
Eleven to fifteen years	12%		
Sixteen to twenty years	10%		
Twenty to twenty-five years	6%		
More than twenty-five years	7%	**Sixteen years or more**	**23%**

Highest degree and year received. In the early study, **48% of the faculty had Ph.D.'s**., 6% had M.F.A.'s, 32% had M.A.'s , and 7% were ABD. The other faculty had M. S. or other degrees. **26% received their highest degree between 1981 and 1985 and 10% received it after 1986; however, 26% received their highest degree before 1970.**

In the second study, 48% of the faculty again had Ph. D.'s, 4.9% had M.F.A.'s, 25.6% had M.A.'s, and 11.9% were ABD. This suggests that more faculty at the M.A. level were actively moving toward the Ph. D. than previously. The difference in the number of M.F.A.'s might be reflective of the changes in the composition of the departments, with fewer departments combined with theatre.

In the first study about 20% of the faculty had received their degrees between 1976 and 1980, and 18% between 1971 and 1975. However, 26% had received them prior to 1970, 26% between 1981 and 1985, and 10% after 1986. These data suggested many new and junior faculty members, and also a large number of senior faculty members. There were fewer mid-career faculty members, as is the case in the professorate in general. **The fact that over one-fourth of the faculty members had received their terminal degree prior to 1970 suggested an important role for faculty development programs**. The great percentage of senior faculty members and faculty who had been at their institutions for over sixteen years suggests a **need in the future to provide new graduates of Ph. D. programs with the opportunity to consider teaching on the small college campus as a reasonable alternative to teaching at a major research institution**. Without the availability of new faculty, smaller institutions may be especially affected by the anticipated shortage of college faculty nationally. The continuation of a smaller program is always of concern when a faculty member retires or leaves, because the smaller overall faculty size for the program means that there is greater personal involvement of each faculty member in the program. Departments of one or two faculty members would be especially hard-hit, and continuation of the whole program would be problematic without replacement staffing. (Buzza, 1985)

Retirements seem to have come from some of the senior faculty members in the years between the two studies, since only 23% of the faculty in the second study had been at their institutions sixteen or more years. **In seniority, then, faculty members are now slightly younger.** The new study further categorized the seniority levels to break senior faculty members into smaller groupings, **and the results suggest that faculty are spread across the various high seniority levels.** The 16-20 year group might be termed late/mid career, and constitute the larger grouping with 10%. **Nevertheless, 6% of the faculty had been at their institutions 20-25 years, and 7% more than 25 years.**

Of the degrees received 1951-1955, two thirds were Ph.D.'s and the rest M.A.'s. This pattern was nearly repeated twenty years later in 1971-1975, with two-thirds of the degrees being Ph.D.'s. However, only 19% of the remaining degrees were M.A.'s, the rest including all other categories listed (ABD, MFA, BA/BS and "other"). The Ph. D. degrees between 1976-80 and 1981- 85 were 56% and 49% respectively, and after 1986 there were 37% Ph.D.'s, **consistent**

with a younger professorate, or those in earlier stages in their careers. After 1986 21% of the respondents indicated they were "ABD" rather than having the M.A. as a terminal degree.

Faculty development programs for this group should respond to the increased number of ABD's, and departments in their staffing plans **need to be cognizant of the potential conflict between heavy teaching responsibilities and the need of an individual to complete his or her graduate thesis.**

Type of undergraduate institution. In the first study about half of those responding indicated that they had attended a small college as an undergraduate; in the second study that question was developed further and revealed that 60% of the faculty responding to the survey had attended their current institutions as undergraduates. The reason for this choice among faculty members and search committees is worth further exploration, and may provide some insight into both faculty career paths and a pool of possible persons to replace retiring faculty.

Race of faculty members. In the first study, **one finding of note was that 98.78% of the faculty at the reporting institutions were White.** In fact, of 328 respondents to this question, only three reported "Black" as their race and only one reported "Hispanic." There were so few non-White faculty members that relevant analysis of this variable could not be made.

In the second study there had been a small percentage change, but again the actual numbers remained low. 96.43% of the respondents (216 people) listed their race as White. In the follow-up study there were 3 listing "Black" as their race, 1 listing "Native American", 1 listing "Hispanic/Spanish Surname," 1 listing "Asian American," and 2 listing "other."

Gender of faculty members. In the early study, 226 men and 125 women made up the pool, giving percentages of 64% and 36% of the total respondents. **In the second study, there had been a slight decrease in the percentage of women faculty members, down to 34.22%. The gender factor provides data which is consistent with that reported nationally, i.e. that more women than men are clustered in the lower ranks. This was true in the early study and continues under the current study. In addition, the shifts in percentages of faculty holding the various ranks, cross referenced with gender, presents a picture which bears further study.**

In the first study, the breakdown by rank was as follows:

Males:		Females:	
professors	**30.1%**	**professors**	**9.9%**
associates	22.2%	associates	25.2%
assistants	32.9%	assistants	33.3%
instructors	12.5%	instructors	26.1%
lecturers	2.3%	lecturers	5.4%

In the current study, this is the breakdown by rank:

Males:		Females:	
professors	**24.29%**	**professors**	**9.21%**
associates	25.17%	associates	23.68%
assistants	39.46%	assistants	38.16%
instructors	**12.5%**	**instructors**	**27.63%**
lecturers	2.71%	lecturers	1.32%

Possible explanations for the difference in the percentages of full professors cross-referenced by gender were considered in the earlier study. Seniority, highest degrees, and when

the highest degree was received seemed to account for some of the variation. The numbers were so small that the percentages needed to be used cautiously. Only 7 women Ph.D.'s had been at their institutions sixteen or more years. Of that group, 43% (or 3 women) received their degrees prior to 1970, 29% (or 2 women) between 1976 and 1980, and another 29% (2 women) received theirs between 1981 and 1985. There were 36 men who had Ph. D.'s and had been at their institutions over sixteen years. **With a one-third female professorate reporting, the difference in these figures (7 compared with 36) suggests a difference in career paths,** particularly when one observes that 58% (or 21) of the men received their Ph. D.'s prior to 1970, 31% (or 11) of the men received them between 1971 and 1975, and only 11% (or 4 men) received their Ph. D.'s between 1976 and 1985. How long the women with the rank of professor had held their Ph. D. degrees might thus account in part for their disproportionate representation in the full professor rank. This poses some interesting **questions concerning the reasons for the variation in career paths which result in the women often completing their terminal degrees later in their careers.**

Comparing the ranks of faculty members by gender over the two studies provides additional information warranting consideration. Male faculty members who were full professors declined from 30% to 24%, consistent with an overall decline in the numbers of faculty members in the upper rank. **The percentage of women faculty members who were full professors declined less than a percentage point, possibly suggesting younger women in those upper ranks, who had not retired since the earlier study but instead were holding steady.** The percentage of male faculty members at the associate rank increased several percentage points, however, while the comparable percentage of female faculty members declined. The variation between the genders at the assistant rank remained relatively small, but the spread at the level of instructor is worth attention. **Not only are there still more female faculty members in the instructor rank, but the percentage gap continues to widen--an increasingly large number of women instructors, without the parallel movement in the associate rank and with a slight decline in the percentage of women who were full professors.**

In the early study:			
Males:		Females:	
16 or more years	30.5%	16 or more years	22.5%
11-15 years	9%	11-15 years	9.2%
6-10 years	17.6%	6-10 years	21.7%
0-5 years	42.9%	0-5 years	46.5%

In the current study:			
Males:		Females:	
25 or more years	8.4%	25 or more years	3.9%
21-25 years	6.8%	21-25 years	3.9%
16-20 years	10.88%	16-20 years	7.79%
total	26.08%	total	15.59%
11-15 years	15.65%	11-15%	5.19%
6-10 years	19.05%	6-10 years	23.38%
2-5 years	25.17%	2-5 years	35.06%
0-1 year	13.61%	0-1 year	20.78%

The women faculty do indeed have less seniority which is consistent with the variation in faculty rank. There continues to be a difference in the highest degree attained, as well. 56% of the male faculty in the current study have the Ph.D., compared to 53% in the early study. 31% of the female faculty have the Ph.D. in the current study, compared with 36% in the early study. **Questions can be raised as to the reasons for the decline in the number of women with Ph.D.'s teaching at small colleges:**

how do these figures compare with national averages and the situations at other types of institutions, with the numbers of men and women recently completing Ph.D.'s, and with the numbers of women currently attending graduate school? **If there are national differences, what is the reason and what will be the result should this situation not reverse? If the figures are unique for small colleges, what is there in the nature of that teaching context which contributes to the situation?**

Summary of Findings

The findings continue to confirm the original picture of considerable diversity among small colleges, yet clearer patterns are emerging. Most of the institutions reporting continue to be private 4-year colleges of 500 to 2000 students and consider themselves to be small colleges. There was an increase in the number of public institutions reporting in the second study, however. Small colleges seem to be found in communities of all size.

There has been a slight decline in the overall percentage of institutions with an institution-wide speech requirement, and the smaller institutions are no longer more likely than the larger ones to include a speech course as a requirement for graduation. Rather **smaller institutions seem to be dropping that requirement, and larger institutions adding it.** In approximately 90% of the institutions, speech communication can be used to fill a general education distribution requirement, generally in the humanities or fine arts.

In the current study departmental names were investigated for the first time. **"Communication" seems to be used in a department's name rather than the word "speech" in most departments, and even the name "speech communication" was considerably less common than "communication studies or communication arts." Few departments, at least by name, are combined speech and drama departments, although course offerings in drama remain significant.**

Public speaking, interpersonal/small group, and media/broadcasting/related courses are the most frequently offered courses, and it should be noted that these are the lower division content areas recommended in the "Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication at the Small College," the outcome of the Hope College summer conference in 1985. (Smitter and Buzza, 1987)

In the first study four full time faculty members was the typical departmental size, with a range of two to six generally depending on institutional size. The follow-up study examined the staffing issue more closely and found **only 20% of the institutions had four full-time faculty members teaching speech courses. More particularly, 31% of the institutions had only 1 faculty member teaching speech full-time, and 30% had 2 or 3 full time faculty members.** Since small, and especially "single person" departments, present a difficult teaching situation--and are especially vulnerable to program elimination--faculty size bears careful monitoring by those who are concerned with program demographics and well as program development. Use of part time faculty continues to be common.

In the earlier study, of the institutions with extra-curricular speech activity programs, fewer than half of the institutions reporting, individual events were more common than debate programs. The question was clarified and elaborated in the present study, in which **86% reported having some kind of extra-curricular program. Drama, individual events, and a campus radio station were most frequently reported,** and only 3 of the 75 campuses reported having an NDT debate program. CEDA and other forms of debate were found on a number of campuses, however.

There seems to have been an increase in the percentage of full-time appointments between the original and follow-up studies, but a decline in the total number of faculty members with tenure. Given other data reported, however, such as fewer faculty in the upper ranks and an overall decline in seniority, **it appears that there have been retirements in the upper ranks, and replacements at the junior faculty level.** The question of tenure lines was not asked in the early study; in the current study **56% of the non-tenured faculty indicated they were in tenure-track appointments,** and the continuation of such faculty lines will be a factor to monitor in the future. **The faculty continue to be generally either junior or senior, with fewer mid-career faculty members** in terms of rank, when the highest degree was received, and the number of years at the institution.

About half the faculty members have Ph. D.'s, although there has been a decline in the percentage of women faculty with Ph.D.'s. along with a slight decline in the percentage of female faculty in general (36% down to 34%). This, coupled with a decline in their seniority at the institutions, may account for some of the differences in faculty ranks which were found to have increased during the two studies. **It appears that the number of women instructors without Ph.D.'s has increased,** a situation which those concerned with the preparation and advancement of women faculty might wish to address, particularly since a delay in receiving the Ph. D. seems to interact with other factors and delay or prevent promotion to the rank of professor.

There has been a **slight increase in the number of faculty of diverse racial backgrounds teaching at small colleges, but the overall number remains very small.** Institutions with Affirmative Action concerns might continue to address these issues.

An unusual finding was that 60% of the faculty who had attended a small college as an undergraduate had attended the institution at which they were presently teaching.

Conclusions

The purpose of the original survey was to update the directory and mailing list of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs of the Speech Communication Association as well as to provide some base data for a long range monitoring of program health and development on small campuses.

The questionnaire considering programs and individual faculty members was greatly improved between the original and follow-up studies and has begun to provide useful information for those purposes. It remains the most comprehensive data currently available to provide a profile of small colleges and their faculty members in speech communication. This survey will be further developed and replicated every three to five years to improve both its methodology and our understanding of small college communication programs.

The findings, especially concerning gender differences among faculty members, while generally consistent with national patterns in the professorate, provide specific data for those wishing to understand and address issues of gender equity among faculty members. Points of departure for additional research have been noted. Demographics progress in issues of gender and racial equity can be monitored through the longitudinal study, as well.

Finally, the present study was undertaken to provide departmental chairs and administrators with some assistance in responding to curricular development and future staffing needs of their programs. While the questionnaire needs further refinement, especially in the area of curricular emphasis, the findings of even this formulative data can provide useful information for institutions

in their program planning and for the Committee on Small College Speech Programs as it seeks to assist its membership in program and professional development.

The present study provides a major step in the demographic analysis of small college speech programs, both in sample size and in data analysis. In addition to providing preliminary information on certain aspects of our programs and faculty members, it provides a basis for the continued and more refined research which will continue.

Appendix

An extensive series of tables accompanies this report. Appendix A summarizes the data for the whole group of institutions, for the faculty as a whole, and for female and male faculty. Appendix B provides information for institutions by size: under 500, 500-1000, 1000-1500, 1500-2000, 2000-3000, 3000-5000, over 5000 students.

References

Becker, Samuel L., J. Ann Selzer, and Hyeon Cheol Choi, "Theatre Programs in American Colleges and Universities," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 46, October, 1983, pp. 32-35.

Becker, Samuel L., Hyeon Cheol Choi, and J. Ann Selzer, "Theatre Faculty in the United States: Background and Task Analysis," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 49, August, 1984, pp. 21-38.

Boase, Paul H., "Speech in the Liberal Arts College," Central States Speech Journal, XVI: Feb. 1965, pp. 23-27.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, "Speech and Theatre Programs in Two Midwest Consortia," paper presented at the 1983 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, "A Second Look at Small Colleges: Definitions and Demographics," paper presented at the 1984 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, "The Small College Environment," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 54, October, 1985, pp. 5-7.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, and Kelli S. Holmes, "A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs: 1987, Formulative Study and Base Data," paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA, November 1989.

Elmore, Garland C., "The Communication Disciplines in Higher Education: A Guide to Academic Programs in the United States and Canada," Association for Communication Administration/Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication joint publication, 1990

Manning, Helen H., "Directions: Comparing Ourselves to our Peers and our Colleagues," paper presented at the 1982 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Smitter, Roger, and Bonnie Wilson Buzza, "The Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication: A Progress Report," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 60, April, 1987, pp.63-66.

Smitter, Roger, and Joseph MacDoniels, "Approaches to the Basic Curriculum in Small College Departments," paper presented at the 1983 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Smitter, Roger, and Joseph MacDoniels, "Departmental Objectives: How Do Small College Programs Define Their Mission?" paper presented at the 1985 convention of the Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Waite, David H., "The Nature of Curricula and Programs of Speech in the Small College or University," paper presented at the 1985 convention of the Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Appendices

A.

Institutional Data: 1991, Second Phase of Study

Institutional Data: 1987, Base Data

Data on Faculty

Data on Female Faculty

Data on Male Faculty

B.

Institutions with Enrollment of Under 500 Students

Institutions with Enrollment of 500-1,000 Students

Institutions with Enrollment of 1,000-1,500 Students

Institutions with Enrollment of 1,500-2,000 Students

Institutions with Enrollment of 2,000-3,000Students

Institutions with Enrollment of 3,000-5,000Students

Institutions with Enrollment of More than 5000 Students

Institutional Data:
1991, Second Phase of Study

Total Number of Institutions Reporting: 89
(Not all responded to all questions)

Enrollment at Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Under 500	6	6%
500-1,000	14	15.70%
1,000-1,500	17	19.10%
15,000-2,000	18	20.20%
2,000-3,000	18	20.20%
3,000-5,000	9	10.10%
Over 5,000	7	7.87%

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000	2	2.35%
1,000-1,500	1	1.18%
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000	6	7.06%
5,000-10,000	18	21.17%
10,000-25,000	13	15.29%
25,000-50,000	8	9.41%
50,000-100,000	17	20%
100,000-250,000	5	5.88%
250,000-500,000	4	4.70%
500,000-1,000,000	6	7.06%
More than 1,000,000	5	5.88%
No Response	4	

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	16	18.10%
Private	72	81.80%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	1	1%
Four-Year	63	72%
Both	24	27%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	44	50%
No	44	50%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	5	5.68%
No	83	94.32%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	83	94.32%
No	5	5.68%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	82	95.35%
No	4	4.65%

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	76	87%
Small Program in Large Institution	6	6.80%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges	5	5.70%

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech	1	1.14%
Speech Communication	12	13.67%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	40	45.45%
Speech and Theatre	4	4.55%
Communication and Theatre/Drama	4	4.45%
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama	4	4.55%
Speech and (anything else)	4	4.55%
Communication and (anything else)	8	9.09%
English	4	4.55%
Other	7	7.95%

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	36
Communication Research Methods	6
Communication Theory and Related Courses	26
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	4
Gender and Communication	1
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	5
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	4
Interpersonal Communication	53
Intrapersonal Communication	5
Journalism and Related Courses	25
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	51
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	11
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	27
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	25
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	20
Public Speaking	56
Speech Communication Education	5
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	5
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	35
Voice and Diction	8
Other	7

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent	
Yes	45	52%	
No	41	48%	
Under 500	4	67%	of those this size
500-1,000	6	43%	" "
1,000-1,500	10	63%	" "
15,000-2,000	7	41%	" "
2,000-3,000	8	47%	" "
3,000-5,000	6	67%	" "
Over 5,000	4	57%	" "

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	9	10.47%
No	77	89.53%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	8	9.20%
No	79	90.80%
Under 500	3	
500-1,000	1	
1,000-1,500		
15,000-2,000	2	
2,000-3,000	1	
3,000-5,000	1	
Over 5,000		

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	77	89.53%
No	9	10.47%

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	4
English/Language/Literature	22
Social/Behavioral Sciences	13
Humanities	24
Fine/Performaing Arts	21
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	11
Other	21

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	75	86.21%
No	12	13.79%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	3
CEDA debate	18
Other debate	11
Readers Theatre	15
Individual Events	39
Drama/Theatre	40
Dance	4
TV station	14
Radio station	38
Newspaper	28
Yearbook	13
Other	14

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0	2	2.24%
1	12	13.48%
2	3	3.37%
3	10	11.23%
4	17	19.10%
5	11	12.36%
6	8	8.99%
More than 6	26	29.21%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0	14	15.73%
1	12	13.48%
2	17	19.10%
3	9	10.11%
4	12	13.48%
5	8	8.99%
6	4	4.49%
More than 6	13	14.61%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	5	5.62%
1	26	29.21%
2	12	13.48%
3	13	14.61%
4	17	19.10%
5	6	6.74%
6	2	2.24%
More than 6	8	8.99%

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	16	17.98%
1	19	21.35%
2	21	23.60%
3	9	10.11%
4	8	8.99%
5	4	4.49%
6	4	4.49%
More than 6	8	8.99%

Institutional Data:
1987, Base Data

(Not all categories of results correspond to those in second phase of study because initial questionaire was modified based on results of earlier pilot project)

Total Number of Institutions Reporting: 128
(Not all responded to all questions)

Enrollment at Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Under 500	7	5.50%
500-1,000	29	22.70%
1,000-1,500	29	22.70%
15,000-2,000	27	21.10%
2,000-3,000	22	17.20%
3,000-5,000	9	7%
Over 5,000	5	3.80%

Population of Town/City of Institution

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	113	88.28%
Private	15	11.72%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	5	4%
Four-Year	123	96%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	65	51%
No	63	49%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	3%
No	123	97%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	118	92.20%
Small Program in Large Institution	6	4.70%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges	4	3.10%

Name of Your Department

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	70	54.69%
No	58	45.31%
Under 500	5	
500-1,000	19	
1,000-1,500	17	
15,000-2,000	13	
2,000-3,000	9	
3,000-5,000	4	
Over 5,000	3	

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

Yes	83.53% of the programs*	*questionnaire design may have given misleading data here
No	16.47% of the programs*	

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

Yes	49.03% of the programs*	*questionnaire design may have given misleading data here
No	50.97% of the programs*	

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

This question was not included in the earlier study.

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number	
NDT debate	19*	*questionaire design may have given
CEDA debate	44*	misleading data here
Readers Theatre	27*	
Individual Events	51*	
Drama/Theatre	61*	

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Percent
0	
1	2.51%
2	11.06%
3	14.82%
4	31.91%
5	16.58%
6	18.34%
More than 6	4.77%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Percent
0	
1	20.35%
2	25.60%
3	18.60%
4	19.69%
5	4.38%
6	6.13%
More than 6	5.25%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

This question was not included in the earlier study.

Data on Faculty

(Not all categories of results correspond to those in second phase of study because initial questionaire was modified based on results of earlier pilot project)

Total Number of Respondents: 227* in 1991
386* in 1987
*Not all respondents answered all questions

Full time/Part time/Temporary

	1991		1987	
Full time	201	88.55%	285	81.30%
Part time	26	11.45%	54	15.30%
Temporary				
Yes	34	15.18%	12	3.40%
No	190	84.82%	347	

Rank

	1991		1987	
Professor	44	19.64%	86	22.30%
Associate	55	24.55%	92	23.90%
Assistant	87	38.84%	131	33.90%
Instructor	33	14.73%	64	16.60%
Lecturer	5	2.23%	13	3.40%

Length of time at Current Institution

	1991		1987		
0-1 Years	36	16%	0-5 years	174	45%
2-5 Years	65	28.89%			
6-10 Years	45	20%	6-10 Years	60	18%
11-15 Years	28	12.44%	11-15 Years	35	9%
16-20 Years	22	9.78%	16+ Years	104	27%
21-25 Years	13	5.78%			
More than 25	16	7.11%			

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	1991	
Yes	83	94.32%
No	5	5.68%

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	1991	
Yes	82	95.35%
No	4	4.65%

Are You Tenured?

	1991		1987*	
Yes	100	44.25%	61.40%	*form of questionaire
No	126	55.75%		may have given
Tenure Track			38.60%	misleading data here

Is Yours a Tenure Track Appointment?

	1991	
Yes	72	55.81%
No	57	44.19%

What is Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987	
Ph. D.	109	48.02%	178	48.63%
M.F.A.	11	4.85%	21	5.74%
ABD	27	11.89%	25	6.83%
M.A.	58	25.55%	77	31.97%
M.S.	9	3.9666%	7	1.91%
B.A./B.S.	6	2.64%	6	1.64%
Other	7	3.08%	12	3.28%

When Did You Receive Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987		
1951-1955	3	1.33%	prior to		
1956-1960	11	4.89%	1970	92	25.59%
1961-1965	13	5.78%			
1966-1970	19	8.44%			
1971-1975	31	13.78%	1971-1975	63	18.50%
1976-1980	36	16%	1976-1980	70	19.69%
1981-1985	55	24.44%	1981-1985	91	25.94%
1986 or later	57	25.33%	1986 or later	35	10.24%

Did you Teach at a Small Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	101	44.69%
No	125	55.31%

Did You teach at Large Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	149	65.93%
No	77	34.07%

Did you Attend a Small College as an Undergraduate?

	1991		1987
Yes	136	60.71%	51.87%
No	88	39.29%	48.13%

Did you Attend Your Present Institution as an Undergraduate?

	1991	
Yes	31	13.66%
No	196	86.34%

What is Your Race?

	1991		1987	
White	216	96.43%	324	98.78%
Native American	1	.45%		
Black	3	1.34%	3	.91%
Hispanic/Spanish Surname	1	.45%	1	.30%
Asian American	1	.45%		
Other	2	.89%		

What is Your Gender?

	1991		1987	
Male	148	65.78%	226	64.39%
Female	77	34.22%	125	35.61%

Data on Female Faculty

(Not all categories of results correspond to those in second phase of study because initial questionaire was modified based on results of earlier pilot project)

Total Number of Respondents: 77* in 1991
125* in 1987
*Not all respondents answered all questions

Full time/Part time/Temporary

	1991		1987	
Full time	59	76.62%		75%
Part time	18	23.38%		21%
Temporary				4%
Yes	19	25.68%		
No	55	74.32%		

Rank

	1991		1987	
Professor	7	9.33%	11	9.91%
Associate	18	24%	28	25.23%
Assistant	28	37.33%	37	33.33%
Instructor	21	28%	29	26.13%
Lecturer	1	1.33%	6	5.41%

Length of time at Current Institution

	1991		1987		
0-1 Years	16	21.05%	0-5 years	56	46.67%
2-5 Years	27	35.53%			
6-10 Years	17	22.37%	6-10 Years	26	21.67%
11-15 Years	4	5.26%	11-15 Years	11	9.17%
16-20 Years	6	7.89%	16+ Years	27	22.5%
21-25 Years	3	3.95%			
More than 25 Years	3	3.95%			

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	1991	
Yes	74	97.37%
No	2	2.63%

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	1991	
Yes	74	97.37%
No	2	2.63%

Are You Tenured?

	1991		1987*	
Yes	23	29.87%	55.70%	*form of questionaire
No	54	70.13%		may have given
Tenure Track			44.30%	misleading data here

Is Yours a Tenure Track Appointment?

	1991	
Yes	24	44.44%
No	30	55.56%

What is Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987	
Ph. D.	24	31.17%	45	36.89%
M.F.A.	4	5.19%	7	5.74%
ABD	8	10.39%	8	6.56%
M.A.	29	37.66%	55	45.08%
M.S.	6	7.79%	1	.82%
B.A./B.S.	4	5.19%	2	1.64%
Other	2	2.6%	4	3.28%

When Did You Receive Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987		
1951-1955	1	1.32%	prior to		
1956-1960	3	3.95%	1970	21	24.14%
1961-1965	4	5.26%			
1966-1970	9	11.84%			
1971-1975	6	7.79%	1971-1975	11	12.65%
1976-1980	13	17.11%	1976-1980	22	25.29%
1981-1985	20	26.32%	1981-1985	25	28.74%
1986 or later	20	26.32%	1986 or later	8	9.20%

Did you Teach at a Small Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	33	42.86%
No	44	57.14%

Did You teach at Large Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	44	57.14%
No	33	42.86%

Did you Attend a Small College as an Undergraduate?

	1991		1987
Yes	47	62.67%	48.33%
No	28	37.33%	51.67%

Did you Attend Your Present Institution as an Undergraduate?

	1991	
Yes	20	25.97%
No	57	74.03%

What is Your Race?

	1991		1987	
White	73	96.05%	114	98.28%
Native American				
Black	2	2.63%	2	1.72%
Hispanic/Spanish Surname				
Asian American	1	1.32%		
Other				

Data on Male Faculty

(Not all categories of results correspond to those in second phase of study because initial questionaire was modified based on results of earlier pilot project)

Total Number of Respondents: 148* in 1991
217* in 1987

*I. . all respondents answered all questions

Full time/Part time/Temporary

	1991		1987
Full time	140	94.59%	85%
Part time	8	5.41%	13%
Temporary			2%
Yes	15	10.14%	
No	133	89.86%	

Rank

	1991		1987	
Professor	36	24.49%	65	30.09%
Associate	37	25.17%	48	22.22%
Assistant	58	39.46%	71	32.87%
Instructor	12	8.16%	27	12.50%
Lecturer	4	2.72%	5	2.32%

Length of time at Current Institution

	1991		1987		
0-1 Years	20	13.61%	0-5 Years	90	42.86%
2-5 Years	37	25.17%			
6-10 Years	28	19.05%	6-10 Years	37	17.62%
11-15 Years	23	15.65%	11-15 Years	19	9.05%
16-20 Years	16	10.88%	16+ Years	64	30.48%
21-25 Years	10	6.8%			
25+ Years	13	8.84%			

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	1991	
Yes	143	97.95%
No	3	2.05%

Does Your Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	1991	
Yes	143	97.28%
No	4	2.72%

Are You Tenured?

	1991		1987*	
Yes	76	51.7%%	55.70%	*form of questionaire
No	71	48.3%		may have given
Tenure Track			34.78%	misleading data here

Is Yours a Tenure Track Appointment?

	1991	
Yes	47	63.51%
No	27	36.49%

What is Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987	
Ph. D.	83	56.08%	117	53.18%
M.F.A.	7	4.73%	12	5.46%
ABD	19	12.84%	15	6.82%
M.A.	29	19.59%	58	36.37%
M.S.	3	2.03%	6	2.73%
B.A./B.S.	2	1.35%	4	1.82%
Other	5	3.38%	8	3.64%

When Did You Receive Your Highest Degree?

Name	1991		1987		
1951-1955	2	1.36%	prior to		
1956-1960	8	5.44%	1970	43	28.67%
1961-1965	9	6.12%			
1966-1970	10	6.8%			
1971-1975	24	16.33%	1971-1975	31	20.67%
1976-1980	23	15.65%	1976-1980	25	16.67%
1981-1985	35	23.81%	1981-1985	36	24%
1986 or later	36	24.49%	1986 or later	15	10%

Did you Teach at a Small Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	66	44.9%
No	81	55.1%

Did You teach at Large Institution Prior to Your Present Institution?

	1991	
Yes	104	70.75%
No	43	29.25%

Did you Attend a Small College as an Undergraduate?

	1991		1987
Yes	89	60.64%	53%
No	58	39.46%	47%

Did you Attend Your Present Institution as an Undergraduate?

	1991	
Yes	11	7.43%
No	137	92.57%

What is Your Race?

	1991		1987	
White	143	96.62%	204	99.03%
Native American	1	.68%	1	.49
Black	1	.68%	1	.49
Hispanic/Spanish Surname	1	.68%		
Asian American				
Other	2	1.35%		

Institutions with Enrollments of Under 500 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 5

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000		
1,000-1,500	1	20%
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000	1	20%
5,000-10,000	1	20%
10,000-25,000	1	20%
25,000-50,000	1	20%
50,000-100,000		
100,000-250,000		
250,000-500,000		
500,000-1,000,000		
More than 1,000,000		

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	2	33.33%
Private	4	66.67%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	1	16.67%
Four-Year	4	66.67%
Both	1	16.67%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	
No	6	100%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	5	83.33%
No	1	16.67%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	5	83.33%
No	1	16.67%

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	6	100%
Small Program in Large Institution		
Large Program/Support Small Colleges		

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech		
Speech Communication	1	16.67%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	2	33.33%
Speech and Theatre		
Communication and Theatre/Drama		
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama		
Speech and (anything else)		
Communication and (anything else)		
English	3	50%
Other		

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	3
Communication Research Methods	
Communication Theory and Related Courses	1
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	
Interpersonal Communication	3
Intrapersonal Communication	
Journalism and Related Courses	2
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	1
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	1
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	1
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	1
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	
Public Speaking	6
Speech Communication Education	
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	1
Voice and Diction	1
Other	1

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	66.67%
No	2	33.33%

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	16.67%
No	5	83.33%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	5	83.33%
No	1	16.67%
No response	1	

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	1
English/Language/Literature	3
Social/Behavioral Sciences	1
Humanities	1
Fine/Performaing Arts	1
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	1
Other	1

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	66.67%
No	2	33.33%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	
CEDA debate	
Other debate	
Readers Theatre	1
Individual Events	
Drama/Theatre	1
Dance	1
TV station	
Radio station	1
Newspaper	2
Yearbook	
Other	1

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	2	33.33%
2		
3		
4	2	33.33%
5	2	33.33%
6		
More than 6		

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2	3	60%
3	1	20%
4		
5		
6		
More than 6	1	20%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	2	33.33%
1	4	66.66%
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
More than 6		

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	2	33.33%
1	1	16.67%
2	2	33.33%
3	1	16.67%
4		
5		
6		
More than 6		

Institutions with Enrollments of 500-1000 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 14

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000		
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000		
5,000-10,000	6	42.86%
10,000-25,000	3	21.43%
25,000-50,000	2	14.29%
50,000-100,000	2	14.29%
100,000-250,000		
250,000-500,000	1	7.14%
500,000-1,000,000		
More than 1,000,000		

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	0	
Private	14	100%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	10	71.43%
Both	4	28.57%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	28.57%
No	10	71.43%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	
No	14	100%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	13	92.86%
No	1	7.14%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	13	92.86%
No	1	7.14%

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	14	100%
Small Program in Large Institution		
Large Program/Support Small Colleges		

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech	1	7.14%
Speech Communication	2	14.29%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	6	42.86%
Speech and Theatre		
Communication and Theatre/Drama	2	14.29%
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama	2	14.29%
Speech and (anything else)	1	7.14%
Communication and (anything else)		
English		
Other		

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	7
Communication Research Methods	
Communication Theory and Related Courses	3
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	2
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	
Interpersonal Communication	9
Intrapersonal Communication	1
Journalism and Related Courses	2
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	7
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	3
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	2
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	1
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	1
Public Speaking	12
Speech Communication Education	2
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	8
Voice and Diction	3
Other	

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	6	42.86%
No	8	57.14%

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	7.14%
No	13	92.86%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	7.14%
No	13	92.86%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	14	100%
No		
No response		

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	
English/Language/Literature	5
Social/Behavioral Sciences	1
Humanities	2
Fine/Performaing Arts	4
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	3
Other	4

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	12	85.71%
No	2	14.29%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	
CEDA debate	3
Other debate	3
Readers Theatre	3
Individual Events	7
Drama/Theatre	7
Dance	
TV station	1
Radio station	4
Newspaper	2
Yearbook	2
Other	1

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	7	50%
2	2	14.29%
3	3	21.43%
4	2	14.29%
5		
6		
More than 6		

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	5	50%
2	2	20%
3	2	20%
4	1	10%
5		
6		
More than 6		

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	1	7.14%
1	9	64.28%
2	2	14.28%
3	2	14.28%
4		
5		
6		
More than 6		

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	4	33.33%
2	4	33.33%
3	2	16.67%
4	2	16.67%
5		
6		
More than 6		

Institutions with Enrollments of 1000-1500 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 17

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000	1	5.88%
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000	3	17.65%
5,000-10,000	4	23.58%
10,000-25,000	5	29.41%
25,000-50,000	1	5.88%
50,000-100,000		
100,000-250,000	2	11.76%
250,000-500,000		
500,000-1,000,000		
More than 1,000,000	1	5.88%

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	0	
Private	17	100%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	12	70.59%
Both	5	29.41%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	5	29.41%
No	12	70.59%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	
No	17	100%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	14	82.35%
No	3	17.65%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	14	93.33%
No	1	6.67%
No Response	2	

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	16	94.12%
Small Program in Large Institution	1	5.88%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges		

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech		
Speech Communication	2	11.76%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	9	52.94%
Speech and Theatre	1	5.88%
Communication and Theatre/Drama	1	5.88%
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama		
Speech and (anything else)		
Communication and (anything else)	2	11.76%
English	1	5.88%
Other	1	5.88%

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	7
Communication Research Methods	1
Communication Theory and Related Courses	2
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	2
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	1
Interpersonal Communication	10
Intrapersonal Communication	2
Journalism and Related Courses	6
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	9
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	1
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	4
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	5
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	5
Public Speaking	12
Speech Communication Education	2
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	8
Voice and Diction	2
Other	

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	10	62.50%
No	6	37.5%
No Response	1	

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	3	18.75%
No	13	81.25%
No Response	1	

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes		
No	16	100%
No Response	1	

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	14	93.33%
No	1	6.67%

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	
English/Language/Literature	3
Social/Behavioral Sciences	1
Humanities	3
Fine/Performaing Arts	3
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	2
Other	3

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	13	81.25%
No	3	18.75%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	
CEDA debate	2
Other debate	3
Readers Theatre	
Individual Events	6
Drama/Theatre	10
Dance	
TV station	4
Radio station	9
Newspaper	6
Yearbook	5
Other	3

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	3	18.75%
2		
3	3	18.75%
4	4	25%
5	4	25%
6		
More than 6	2	12.5%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	3	21.43%
2	2	14.29%
3	2	14.29%
4	3	21.43%
5	2	14.29%
6		
More than 6	2	14.29%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0	1	5.88%
1	10	58.82%
2	1	5.88%
3	4	23.53%
4	1	5.88%
5		
6		
More than 6		

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	4	30.77%
2	3	23.08%
3	2	15.38%
4	2	15.38%
5		
6	1	7.69%
More than 6	1	7.69%

Institutions with Enrollments of 1,500-2,000 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 18

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000	1	5.56%
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000	2	11.11%
5,000-10,000	3	16.67%
10,000-25,000	2	11.11%
25,000-50,000	2	11.11%
50,000-100,000	5	27.78%
100,000-250,000		
250,000-500,000	1	5.56%
500,000-1,000,000	1	5.56%
More than 1,000,000	1	5.56%

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	2	11.11%
Private	16	88.89%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	15	83.33%
Both	3	16.67%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	8	44.44%
No	10	55.56%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	
No	18	100%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	18	100%
No		

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	17	94.44%
No	1	5.56%

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	17	94.44%
Small Program in Large Institution		
Large Program/Support Small Colleges	1	5.56%

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech Communication	4	22.22%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	6	33.33%
Speech and Theatre		
Communication and Theatre/Drama	2	11.11%
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama	1	5.56%
Speech and (anything else)		
Communication and (anything else)	4	22.22%
English		
Other	1	5.56%

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	6
Communication Research Methods	1
Communication Theory and Related Courses	9
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	1
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	2
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	1
Interpersonal Communication	11
Intrapersonal Communication	1
Journalism and Related Courses	5
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	11
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	1
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	5
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	7
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	4
Public Speaking	8
Speech Communication Education	
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	1
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	7
Voice and Diction	
Other	4

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	41.18%
No	10	58.82%
No Reply	1	

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes		
No	18	100%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	2	11.11%
No	16	88.89%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	16	88.89%
No	2	11.11%

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	2
English/Language/Literature	6
Social/Behavioral Sciences	6
Humanities	7
Fine/Performaing Arts	8
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	2
Other	2

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	15	83.33%
No	3	16.67%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	
CEDA debate	6
Other debate	1
Readers Theatre	4
Individual Events	12
Drama/Theatre	7
Dance	
TV station	1
Radio station	9
Newspaper	5
Yearbook	1
Other	2

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2		
3	1	5.56%
4	7	38.89%
5	3	16.67%
6	2	11.11%
More than 6	5	27.78%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	1	6.67%
2	5	33.33%
3	3	20%
4	1	6.67%
5	3	20%
6	2	13.33%
More than 6		

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	2	14.29%
2	5	35.71%
3	2	14.29%
4	1	7.14%
5	2	14.29%
6	1	7.14%
More than 6	1	7.14%

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	2	14.29%
2	5	35.71%
3	2	14.29%
4	1	7.14%
5	2	14.29%
6	1	7.14%
More than 6	1	7.14%

Institutions with Enrollments of 2,000-3,000 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 17

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000		
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000		
5,000-10,000	3	17.65%
10,000-25,000	1	5.88%
25,000-50,000	2	11.76%
50,000-100,000	5	29.41%
100,000-250,000	1	5.88%
250,000-500,000	1	5.88%
500,000-1,000,000	3	17.65%
More than 1,000,000	1	5.88%

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	2	11.76%
Private	15	88.24%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	14	82.35%
Both	3	17.65%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	10	58.82%
No	7	41.18%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	5.88%
No	16	94.12%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	17	100%
No		

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	17	100%
No	0	

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	16	94.14%
Small Program in Large Institution	1	5.88%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges		

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech		
Speech Communication	1	5.88%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	8	47.06%
Speech and Theatre	1	5.88%
Communication and Theatre/Drama	1	5.88%
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama	1	5.88%
Speech and (anything else)	2	11.76%
Communication and (anything else)	1	5.88%
English		
Other	2	11.76%

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	7
Communication Research Methods	2
Communication Theory and Related Courses	5
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	1
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	1
Interpersonal Communication	12
Intrapersonal Communication	
Journalism and Related Courses	5
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	13
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	2
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	6
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	7
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	4
Public Speaking	11
Speech Communication Education	
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	3
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	7
Voice and Diction	1
Other	

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	8	47.06%
No	9	52.94%

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	2	12.5%
No	14	87.5%
No Reply	1	

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	5.88%
No	16	94.12%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	14	82.35%
No	3	17.65%

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	1
English/Language/Literature	4
Social/Behavioral Sciences	4
Humanities	3
Fine/Performaing Arts	2
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	3
Other	5

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	15	88.24%
No	2	11.76%

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	1
CEDA debate	4
Other debate	3
Readers Theatre	3
Individual Events	7
Drama/Theatre	7
Dance	2
TV station	2
Radio station	8
Newspaper	5
Yearbook	3
Other	5

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2	1	5.88%
3	3	17.65%
4	1	5.88%
5		
6	4	23.53%
More than 6	8	47.06%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	2	13.33%
2	3	20%
3	1	6.67%
4	4	26.67%
5	2	13.33%
6	2	13.33%
More than 6	1	6.67%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	1	5.88%
2	4	23.53%
3	4	23.53%
4	5	29.41%
5		
6		
More than 6	3	17.65%

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	4	28.57%
2	4	28.57%
3	2	14.29%
4	1	7.14%
5	2	7.14%
6		
More than 6	1	7.14%

Institutions with Enrollments of 3,000-5,000 Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 9

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000		
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000		
5,000-10,000	1	11.11%
10,000-25,000		
25,000-50,000		
50,000-100,000	4	44.44%
100,000-250,000	2	22.22%
250,000-500,000	1	11.11%
500,000-1,000,000		
More than 1,000,000	1	11.11%

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	3	33.33%
Private	6	66.66%

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	4	44.44%
Both	5	55.55%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	77.78%
No	2	22.22%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0
No	9	100%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	9	100%
No		

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	9	100%
No	0	

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	5	62.5%
Small Program in Large Institution	2	25%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges	1	12.5%
No Response	1	

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech		
Speech Communication	1	11.11%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	5	55.56%
Speech and Theatre		
Communication and Theatre/Drama		
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama		
Speech and (anything else)		
Communication and (anything else)		
English	3	
Other		33.33%

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	3
Communication Research Methods	1
Communication Theory and Related Courses	3
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	
Gender and Communication	1
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	
Interpersonal Communication	4
Intrapersonal Communication	
Journalism and Related Courses	4
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	6
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	1
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	4
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	3
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	2
Public Speaking	2
Speech Communication Education	1
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	1
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	4
Voice and Diction	1
Other	1

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	6	66.67%
No	3	33.33%

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	11.11%
No	8	88.89%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	1.11%
No	8	8.89%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	77.78%
No	2	22.22%

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	
English/Language/Literature	
Social/Behavioral Sciences	
Humanities	4
Fine/Performaing Arts	1
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	
Other	3

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	9	100%
No		

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	2
CEDA debate	1
Other debate	
Readers Theatre	2
Individual Events	6
Drama/Theatre	5
Dance	
TV station	3
Radio station	5
Newspaper	5
Yearbook	1
Other	1

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2		
3		
4	1	11.11%
5	2	22.22%
6		
More than 6	6	66.67%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2	2	22.22%
3		
4	2	22.22%
5		
6		
More than 6	5	55.56%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2	2	22.22%
3	1	11.11%
4	3	33.33%
5	2	22.22%
6		
More than 6	1	11.11%

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	1	11.11%
2	3	33.33%
3		
4	2	22.22%
5		
6	1	11.11%
More than 6	2	22.22%

Institutions with Enrollments of 5,000 or More Students

Total Number of Institutions This Size Reporting: 7

Population of Town/City of Institution

Size	Number	Percent
Less than 1,000		
1,000-1,500		
1,500-2,000		
2,000-2,500		
2,500-5,000		
5,000-10,000		
10,000-25,000	1	20%
25,000-50,000		
50,000-100,000	1	20%
100,000-250,000		
250,000-500,000		
500,000-1,000,000	2	40%
More than 1,000,000	1	20%
No Response	2	

Public or Private Institution

	Number	Percent
Public	7	100%
Private		

Type of Degree(s) Institution Offers

	Number	Percent
Two-Year	0	
Four-Year	4	57.14%
Both	3	42.86%

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	100%
No		

Does Institution Offer Graduate Degrees in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	57.14%
No	3	42.86%

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Any Department?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	100%
No		

Does Institution Offer Tenure to Faculty in Speech Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	100%
No		

Type of Program/Institution

	Number	Percent
Small College	2	28.57%
Small Program in Large Institution	2	28.57%
Large Program/Support Small Colleges	3	42.86%

Name of Your Department

Name	Number	Percent
Speech		
Speech Communication	1	14.29%
Communication (Studies) (Arts)	4	57.14%
Speech and Theatre		
Communication and Theatre/Drama		
Speech Comm. and Theatre/Drama		
Speech and (anything else)	1	14.29%
Communication and (anything else)	1	14.29%
Engiish		
Other		

Areas Emphasized in Your Department

Name	Number (more than one could be listed)
Argumentation/Persuasion/Debate	3
Communication Research Methods	1
Communication Theory and Related Courses	3
Free Speech/Communication Ethics	
Gender and Communication	
Independent Studies, Special Seminars, Internships	1
Intercultural/Cross-cultural Communication	1
Interpersonal Communication	4
Intrapersonal Communication	1
Journalism and Related Courses	1
Media/Broadcasting and Related Courses	4
Oral Interpretation/Readers Theatre	
Organizational/Business/Professional Communication	5
Public Address/Rhetorical Criticism	
Public Relations/Advertising and Related courses	4
Public Speaking	5
Speech Communication Education	
Speech Disorders/Speech Pathology	
Theatre/Dramatic Arts	
Voice and Diction	
Other	

Institution-Wide Communication Requirement?

	Number	Percent
Yes	4	57.14%
No	3	42.86%

Institution-Wide Proficiency Exam in Communication?

	Number	Percent
Yes	1	14.29%
No	6	85.71%

"Speaking Across the Curriculum" Program?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0
No	7	100%

Do Speech Courses Fulfill any General Ed./ Distribution/Graduation Requirements?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	100%
No		

In Which Areas Do Speech Courses Fulfill this Requirement?

Area	Number
Natural Sciences/Math	
English/Language/Literature	1
Social/Behavioral Sciences	
Humanities	3
Fine/Performaing Arts	2
Human./Fine/Perf. Arts	
Other	2

Does Your Department Sponsor Extra-curricular Activities?

	Number	Percent
Yes	7	100%
No		

What Extra-curricular Activities Does Your Department Sponsor?

Name	Number
NDT debate	
CEDA debate	2
Other debate	1
Readers Theatre	2
Individual Events	1
Drama/Theatre	2
Dance	1
TV station	3
Radio station	2
Newspaper	3
Yearbook	1
Other	1

Number of Full-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	2	28.57%
More than 6	5	71.43%

Number of Part-time Faculty in the Entire Department

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	1	14.29%
2		
3		
4	1	14.29%
5	1	14.29%
6		
More than 6	4	57.14%

Number of Full-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	1	14.29%
2		
3		
4	1	14.29%
5	2	28.57%
6	1	14.29%
More than 6	2	28.57%

Number of Part-time Faculty in Speech Communication

Size	Number	Percent
0		
1	3	42.86%
2		
3		
4		
5	1	14.29%
6	1	14.29%
More than 6	2	28.57%